## For the Northern District of California

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	SAN JOSE DIVISION
10	ALBERT RUDGAYZER, CASE NO. 5:12-cv-01399 EJD
11	ORDER DISMISSING CASE Plaintiff(s),
12	V. V.
13	YAHOO!, INC.,
14	Defendant(s).
15	/
16	On December 12, 2012, the court ordered Plaintiff to show cause in writing by December 31
17	2012, why this action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute after Plaintiff failed to file an
18	amended complaint. See Docket Item No. 37. The court advised Plaintiff that this case would be
19	dismissed if he did not respond or otherwise demonstrate good cause why this case should not be
20	dismissed. <u>Id</u> .
21	On December 26, 2012, Plaintiff filed a return indicating that he would not be filing an
22	amended complaint. See Docket Item No. 40. Accordingly, this case is DISMISSED WITH
23	PREJUDICE pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). The Clerk shall close this file.
24	IT IS SO ORDERED.
25	Dated: January 2, 2013  EDWARD I DAVILA
26	United States District Judge
27	

28